

Applicant also respectfully submits that the allegedly distinct embodiments are not distinct because each of the methods shown in Figs. 3, 4 and 5, cited by the Election Requirement, in addition to Fig. 2, are different aspects of a single invention.

Fig. 3 merely shows one exemplary embodiment of the steps that can be taken to implement step S1300 shown in Fig. 2. Fig. 4 merely shows one exemplary embodiment of the steps that can be taken to implement S1320 in Fig. 3. Thus, Fig. 3 is generic to Fig. 4, and Fig. 2 is a generic to Figs. 3 and 4.

Furthermore, Fig. 5 merely shows one exemplary embodiment of the steps that can be taken to implement step S1700 of Fig. 2 where the reformatted data is inverse reformatted to generate the original binary images. Thus, Figs. 3 and 5 are complementary figures that show a method and its corresponding inverse method. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Figs. 2-5 show steps of one exemplary embodiment of a single invention.

Additionally, claims 13-27 are linking claims that recited both the compression and decompression features of this invention, as well as the features illustrated in Figs. 3 and 5. Thus, claim 13 is generic to all of the asserted amendments, requiring examination of all of the features of Figs. 3 and 5 to determine its patentability.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all species is sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one species would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining species. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. Applicant is also entitled to examination of a reasonable number of species. Thus, even if Figs. 3 and 5 could be considered to be distinct species, two species is a reasonable number. See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions" (emphasis added). It is

respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application in order to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to Applicant and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Thus, for at least these reasons, withdrawal of the Election of Species Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen J. Roe
Registration No. 34,463

JAO:SJR:SSK/ssk

Date: September 16, 2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--